arXiv:1110.3465v7 [math.GM] 18 Apr 2012

ON THE REPRESENTATION OF EVEN NUMBERS AS THE SUM OF TWO PRIMES AND THE REPRESENTATION OF ODD NUMBERS AS THE SUM OF AN ODD PRIME NUMBER AND AN EVEN SEMIPRIME AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIMES IN SHORT INTERVALS

SHAN-GUANG TAN

Date: January 6, 2012 and, in revised form, June 6, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11A41, 11A99.

Key words and phrases. number theory, distribution of primes, Goldbach's conjecture, Lemoine's conjecture, Legendre's conjecture, Oppermann's conjecture, Brocard's conjecture, Andrica's conjecture.

ABSTRACT. Part One:

The representation of even numbers as the sum of two primes and the distribution of primes in short intervals were investigated and a main theorem was given out and proved in this paper, which states: For every number n greater than a positive number n_0, let q be an odd prime number smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and $d = 2n - q$, then there is always at least an odd number d which does not contain any prime factor smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and must be an odd prime number greater than $2n - \sqrt{2n}$.

The proof of the main theorem is based upon the fundamental theorem of Arithmetic and the theory of Linear Algebra, and its main idea is that if all of odd numbers d are composite numbers, a group of linear equations can be formed for a group of primes smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$, which should be solutions of the group of linear equations, so when a contradiction between the expectation and the actual results of the solutions is obtained, the main theorem will be proved.

Based upon the main theorem, it was proved that for every number n greater than 1, there are always at least a pair of primes p and q which are symmetrical about the number n so that even numbers greater than 2 can be expressed as the sum of two primes. Hence, the Goldbach's conjecture was proved.

Also based upon the main theorem, theorems of the distribution of primes in short intervals were given out and proved. By these theorems, the Legendre's conjecture, the Oppermann's conjecture, the Hanssner's conjecture, the Brocard's conjecture, the Andrica's conjecture, the Sierpinski's conjecture and the Sierpinski's conjecture of triangular numbers were proved and the Mills' constant can be determined.

Part Two:

The representation of odd numbers as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime and the distribution of primes in short intervals were investigated and a main theorem was given out and proved in this paper, which states: For every number n greater than a positive number n_0, let q be an odd prime number smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and $d = 2n + 1 - 2q$, then there is always at least an odd number d which does not contain any odd prime factor smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and must be a prime number greater than $2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}$.

The proof of the main theorem is based upon the fundamental theorem of Arithmetic and the theory of Linear Algebra, and its main idea is that if all of odd numbers d are composite numbers, a group of linear equations can be formed for a group of primes smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$, which should be solutions of the group of linear equations, so when a contradiction between the expectation and the actual results of the solutions is obtained, the main theorem will be proved.

Based upon the main theorem, it was proved that for every number n greater than 2, there are always at least a pair of primes p and q so that all odd integers greater than 5 can be represented as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime. Hence, the Lemoine's conjecture was proved.

Also based upon the main theorem, theorems of the distribution of primes in short intervals were given out and proved. By these theorems, the Legendre's conjecture and the Andrica's conjecture were proved and the Mills' constant can be determined.

Part 1. On the representation of even numbers as the sum of two primes and the distribution of primes in short intervals

Introduction

0.1. **Goldbach's conjecture.** Goldbach's conjecture is one of the oldest unsolved problems in number theory and in all of mathematics. It states: Every even number greater than 2 is a Goldbach number, a number that can be expressed as the sum of two primes[1-9]. For small values of even numbers N, the Goldbach's conjecture has been verified for $N \leq 1.609 \times 10^{18}$ and some higher small ranges up to 4×10^{18} by T. Oliveira e Silva[1].

Considerable work has been done on the weak Goldbach's conjecture[1].

The strong Goldbach's conjecture is much more difficult. Chen Jingrun showed in 1973 using the methods of sieve theory that every sufficiently large even number can be written as the sum of either two primes, or a prime and a semiprime (the product of two primes)[1,3]. In 1975, Hugh Montgomery and Robert Charles Vaughan showed that "most" even numbers were expressible as the sum of two primes. More precisely, they showed that there are alwaysed positive constants c and C such that for all sufficiently large numbers N, every even number less than N is the sum of two primes, with at most CN^{1-c} exceptions. In particular, the set of even integers which are not the sum of two primes has density zero[1,4]. Linnik proved in 1951 the existence of a constant K such that every sufficiently large even number is the sum of two primes and at most K powers of 2. Roger Heath-Brown and Jan-Christoph Schlage-Puchta in 2002 found that K=13 works[1,5]. This was improved to K=8 by Pintz and Ruzsa[1,6].

0.2. **Legendre's conjecture.** Legendre's conjecture is one of Landau's problems (1912). It states: There is a prime number p between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for every positive number m(Hardy and Wright 1979, p. 415[11,13]; Ribenboim 1996, pp. 397-398[11,14]).

Although it is not known if there is always a prime p between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$, Chen (1975) has shown that a number P which is either a prime or semiprime does always satisfy this inequality[11,12]. Moreover, there is always a prime between $m - m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 23/42$ (Iwaniec and Pintz 1984[11,15]; Hardy and Wright 1979, p. 415[11,13]).

The smallest primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for $m = 1, 2, ...$, are 2, 5, 11, 17, 29, 37, 53, 67, 83, ... (Sloane's A007491)[16]. The numbers of primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for $m = 1, 2, ...$ are given by 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 4, 3, 4, ... (Sloane's A014085)[16].

0.3. **Works in this paper.** The representation of even numbers as the sum of two primes and the distribution of primes in short intervals were investigated and a main theorem was given out and proved in this paper, which states: For every number n greater than a positive number n_0, let q be an odd prime number smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and $d = 2n - q$, then there is always at least an odd number d which does not contain any prime factor smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and must be an odd prime number greater than $2n - \sqrt{2n}$.

The proof of the main theorem is based upon the fundamental theorem of Arithmetic and the theory of Linear Algebra, and its main idea is that if all of odd numbers d are composite numbers, a group of linear equations can be formed for a group of primes smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$, which should be solutions of the group of linear equations, so when a contradiction between the expectation and the actual results of the solutions is obtained, the main theorem will be proved.

Based upon the main theorem, it was proved that for every number n greater than 1, there are always at least a pair of primes p and q which are symmetrical about the number n so that even numbers greater than 2 can be expressed as the sum of two primes. Hence, the Goldbach's conjecture was proved.

Also based upon the main theorem, theorems of the distribution of primes in short intervals were given out and proved.

1. It was proved that for every positive number m there is always one prime between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$. Hence the Legendre's conjecture was proved.

2. It was proved that for every positive number m there are always two primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$. One is between m^2 and $m(m+1)$, and another is between $m(m+1)$ and $(m+1)^2$. Hence the Oppermann's conjecture was proved[19].

3. It was proved that for every positive number m there are always three primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$. The first one is between m^3 and $m^2(m+1)$, the second one is between $m^2(m+1)$ and $m(m+1)^2$, and the third one is between $m(m+1)^2$ and $(m+1)^3$. Hence the theorem can be used to determine the Mills' constant[17].

4. It was proved that for every positive number m there are always k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$ where k is a positive integer greater than 1. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, there is always one prime between $m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}$ and $m^{k-i}(m+1)^i$.

5. It was proved that there are at least two prime numbers between p_i^2 and $p_i p_{i+1}$, and there are also at least two prime numbers between $p_i p_{i+1}$ and p_{i+1}^2, for $i > 1$, where p_i is the i^{th} prime number. Hence the Hanssner's conjecture was proved[8].

6. It was proved that there are at least four prime numbers between p_i^2 and p_{i+1}^2, for $i > 1$, where p_i is the i^{th} prime number. Hence the Brocard's conjecture was proved[20].

7. It was proved that for every positive number m there are always four primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$. Hence the theorem can be used to determine the Mills' constant[17].

8. It was proved that for every positive number $m \geq a^k - 1$ where a and k are integers greater than 1, if there are at least S_k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$, then there are always S_{k+1} primes between m^{k+1} and $(m+1)^{k+1}$ where $S_{k+1} = aS_k$.

9. It was proved that there is always a prime between $m - m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is a positive number greater than a positive number $2n_0$.

10. It was proved that there is always a prime between m and $m + m^\theta$ where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is a positive number greater than a positive number $2n_0$.

11. It was proved that the inequality $\sqrt{p_{i+1}} - \sqrt{p_i} < 1$ holds for all $i > 0$, where p_i is the i^{th} prime number. Hence the Andrica's conjecture was proved[18].

12. It was proved that there is always one prime number between km and $(k+1)m$ where m is a positive number greater than 1 and $1 \leq k < m$.

13. It was proved that if the numbers $1, 2, 3, \cdots, m^2$ with $m > 1$ are arranged in m rows each containing m numbers, then each row contains at least one prime number. Hence the Sierpinski's conjecture was proved[8].

14. It was proved that between any two triangular numbers, there is at least one prime number. Hence the Sierpinski's conjecture of triangular numbers was proved[8].

.

1. Definitions

1.1. **Sets of primes.** Let n denote a positive number greater than 1, an even number $N = 2n$ and a set of primes P denote all odd primes smaller than or equal to the number n where

$$P = \{p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_l\}, 3 = p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_l \leq n. \tag{1.1}$$

By the fundamental theorem of Arithmetic, a positive number $n \geq 2$ can be written as one of three expressions as follows

$$\begin{aligned} n &= 2^{\alpha}, \\ n &= p_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} p_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_{i_s}^{\alpha_s}, \quad 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_s \leq l, \\ n &= 2^{\alpha} p_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} p_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_{i_s}^{\alpha_s}, \quad 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_s < l, \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where $p_{i_j} \in P$, α and α_j are positive integers for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, s$.

Then, let P_s and Q denote two subsets of P where

$$\begin{aligned} P_s &= \{\} = \phi \subset P \qquad \texttt{for } n = 2^{\alpha}, \\ P_s &= \{p_{i_1}, p_{i_2}, \cdots, p_{i_s}\} \subset P \quad \texttt{for } n \neq 2^{\alpha}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$Q = P \backslash P_s = \{q_1, q_2, \cdots, q_m\} \subset P, \tag{1.4}$$

$$3 \leq q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_m < n.$$

Let take the first $r < m$ elements of Q to form a prime set Q_r, that is

$$Q_r = \{q_1, q_2, \cdots, q_r\} \subset Q \tag{1.5}$$

where if $\sqrt{2n} < q_1$ then $r = 1$ else

$$3 \leq q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_r < \sqrt{2n} < q_{r+1} < n$$

where the number r is dependent of the number n. Generally speaking, the bigger the number n, the bigger the number r is. For examples, when $n = 2^3$, there is $r = 1$, when $n = 2^4$, there is $r = 2$, $\cdots$, and when $n = 3 * 5$ or $n = 2 * 3 * 5$ or $n = 2^2 * 3 * 5$, there is $r = 1$, when $n = 2^3 * 3 * 5$, there is $r = 3$, $\cdots$.

Let consider the following equation

$$a_{min} q_{r+1} + q_r = 2n$$

where a_{min} is a real. Since there is at most one prime which is a prime factor of the number n and greater than $\sqrt{n}$ between q_r and q_{r+1}, we have $q_{r+1} < 4q_r$ and

$$a_{min} = \frac{2n - q_r}{q_{r+1}} > \frac{2n - q_r}{4q_r} > \frac{\sqrt{2n} - 1}{4}. \tag{1.6}$$

1.2. **Linear equations.** Let make a main assumption which may be called Goldbach anti-conjecture.

Definition 1.1 (Goldbach anti-conjecture)**.** There is at least an even number greater than 2, which can not be expressed as the sum of two primes.

According to the Goldbach anti-conjecture (1.1) and by using the prime set Q, take $q_i \in Q$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ and let an odd number $d_i = 2n - q_i$, then all of odd numbers d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ should be composite numbers.

By the fundamental theorem of Arithmetic, for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, we can write

$$d_i = q_{i,1}^{\alpha_{i,1}} q_{i,2}^{\alpha_{i,2}} \cdots q_{i,m_i}^{\alpha_{i,m_i}} \tag{1.7}$$

where m_i is the sum of different prime factors of d_i and $\alpha_{i,1}, \alpha_{i,2} \cdots \alpha_{i,m_i}$ are positive integers. Since d_i and n have no common prime factors, there are $q_{i,k} \in Q$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m_i$.

For $j_i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$, when $q_{j_i} \in Q_r$ is equal to $q_{i,k}$ which is a prime factor of d_i, let denote

$$a_{i,j_i} = d_i/q_{j_i} = q_{i,1}^{\alpha_{i,1}} q_{i,2}^{\alpha_{i,2}} \cdots q_{i,k}^{\alpha_{i,k}-1} \cdots q_{i,m_i}^{\alpha_{i,m_i}} \tag{1.8}$$

where since $q_{j_i} \leq q_r < q_{r+1}$ for $j_i \leq r$,

$$\frac{2n - q_r}{q_{j_i}} - a_{min} = \frac{2n - q_r}{q_{j_i}} - \frac{2n - q_r}{q_{r+1}} = (2n - q_r)\frac{q_{r+1} - q_{j_i}}{q_{j_i} q_{r+1}} > 0$$

and

$$\frac{2n - q_{r+1}}{q_{j_i}} - a_{min} \geq \frac{2n - q_{r+1}}{q_r} - \frac{2n - q_r}{q_{r+1}} = (2n - q_{r+1} - q_r)\frac{q_{r+1} - q_r}{q_r q_{r+1}} > 0,$$

then there are $a_{i,j_i} > a_{min}$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $1 \leq j_i \leq r$.

Hence, we can form a group of equalities as follows

$$q_i + a_{i,j_i} q_{j_i} = 2n \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, m \texttt{ and } 1 \leq j_i \leq r \tag{1.9}$$

where since q_i is not a prime factor of n then $q_i \neq q_{j_i}$.

Definition 1.2 (Linear equations)**.** Based upon the Goldbach anti-conjecture (1.1) and by using the prime set Q_r and expressions (1.7-1.9), let define a group of linear equations in the matrix form

$$\mathbf{A}x = b \tag{1.10}$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & a_{1,j_1} & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & a_{2,j_2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_{r,j_r} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, b = 2n \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}, x = \begin{Bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_r \end{Bmatrix}$$

where all diagonal elements $a_{i,i} = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and there is just one non-diagonal and non-zero element a_{i,j_i} in every row of the matrix $\mathbf{A}$. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $1 \leq j_i \leq r$ and $j_i \neq i$, a_{i,j_i} is an odd number greater than 1 and satisfies $a_{i,j_i} > a_{min}$, a_{i,j_i} and n have no common prime factors, and $q_i \in Q_r$ is neither a prime factor of a_{i,j_i} nor a prime factor of n.

Since $1 \leq |det(\mathbf{A})| \leq |1 + (-1)^{r+1} a_{1,j_1} a_{2,j_2} \cdots a_{r,j_r}|$, there is $det(\mathbf{A}) \neq 0$. Therefore let $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ denote the inverse and adjoint matrix of $\mathbf{A}$, respectively.

Let make a new and equivalent definition of the Goldbach's conjecture.

Definition 1.3 (Goldbach's conjecture)**.** For any even number greater than 2, by Definition (1.2), at least one group of primes $q \in Q$ do not satisfy Equation (1.10).

In other words, at least for one group of primes $q \in Q$, a corresponding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (1.2) can not be formed to let the group of primes $q \in Q$ satisfy Equation (1.10) or some of non-diagonal and non-zero elements a_{i,j_i} of the corresponding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (1.2) can not be odd numbers greater than 1.

It is easy to prove that Definition (1.3) is equivalent to the normal definition of the Goldbach's conjecture.

Proof. First, if any even number greater than 2 can be expressed as the sum of two primes, then for the even number, at least for one group of primes $q \in Q$, a corresponding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (1.2) can not be formed to let the group of primes $q \in Q$ satisfy Equation (1.10).

Next, for any even number greater than 2, if at least for one group of primes $q \in Q$, a corresponding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (1.2) can not be formed to let the group of primes $q \in Q$ satisfy Equation (1.10), then the even number can be expressed as the sum of two primes.

The proof of the equivalence of Definition (1.3) to the normal definition of the Goldbach's conjecture is completed. ☐

Thus Definition (1.3) relates the Goldbach's conjecture to solutions of Equation (1.10). According to the new and equivalent definition of the Goldbach's conjecture (1.3) and by proving that the group of primes $q_i \in Q_r$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ do not satisfy Equation (1.10), we can prove the Goldbach's conjecture that even numbers greater than 2 can be expressed as the sum of two primes.

2. Lemmas of linear equations

2.1. Solutions of linear equations.

Lemma 2.1. *By Definition (1.2) and with* $det(\boldsymbol{A}) \neq 1$*, the matrix* $\boldsymbol{A}$ *or at least one of its sub-matrixes can be written as*

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a_{1,r} \\ a_{2,1} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{3,2} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a_{r,r-1} & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.1}$$

For a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ *in Form (2.1), solutions to Equation (1.10) are*

$$x_i = \frac{2n}{1 + a_i \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i-1,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r \tag{2.2}$$

where $i - 1 \equiv r, 1, \cdots, r-1 (mod\ r)$ *for* $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$,

$$a_1 = a_{2,1}, a_2 = a_{3,2}, \cdots, a_r = a_{1,r} \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i,i} &= a_i b_{i,i} = a_i, & i &= 1, 2, \cdots, r, \\ c_{i,j} &= a_i b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j} \prod_{k=j}^{i} a_k, & j &< i = 2, 3, \cdots, r, \\ c_{i,j} &= a_i b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j+r} \prod_{k=1}^{i} a_k \prod_{k=j}^{r} a_k, & i &< j = 2, 3, \cdots, r, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where $b_{i,j}$ *are elements of* $\boldsymbol{B}$ *which is the adjoint matrix of* $\boldsymbol{A}$*.*

Proof. By exchanging its rows and columns, the matrix **A** in Definition (1.2) can be written as one of three forms.

The first form of **A** is Form (2.1).

The second form of **A** is

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} & \mathbf{A}_s & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & a_{s+1,j_{s+1}} & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & a_{s+2,j_{s+2}} & \cdots & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & 0 \\ \cdots & a_{r,j_r} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.5}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_s$ is a sub-matrix of **A** and similar to Form (2.1). Thus, we can only investigate the first form of **A**.

The third form of **A** is

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{A}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{A}_m \end{bmatrix}$$

where any one of $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_m$ is a sub-matrix of **A** and similar to Form (2.1) or (2.5). Thus, we can only investigate the first form of **A**.

Hence, without lose of generality, let consider solutions of Equation (1.10) with a matrix **A** in Form (2.1).

Then, we obtain

$$det(\mathbf{A}) = 1 + (-1)^{r+1} a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{r-1} a_r \tag{2.6}$$

where $a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_r$ are defined by Expression (2.3), and

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & b_{1,2} & \cdots & b_{1,r} \\ b_{2,1} & 1 & \cdots & b_{2,r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{r,1} & b_{r,2} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rr} b_{i,i} = 1, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r, \\ b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j} \prod_{k=j}^{i-1} a_k, & j < i = 2, 3, \cdots, r, \\ b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j+r} \prod_{k=1}^{i-1} a_k \prod_{k=j}^{r} a_k, & i < j = 2, 3, \cdots, r. \end{array} \tag{2.8}$$

According to Expression (2.8) and for $r + 1 \equiv 1 (mod\ r)$, we have

$$\max\{|b_{i,j}||j = 1, 2, \cdots, r\} = |b_{i,i+1}|, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rr} \frac{b_{i,j}}{b_{i,i+1}} = (-1)^{i+j+1} \frac{1}{\prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} a_k}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1, j > i, \\ \frac{b_{i,j}}{b_{i,i+1}} = (-1)^{i+j+1} \frac{1}{\prod_{k=j+1}^{i-1} a_k \prod_{k=i+1}^{r} a_k}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1, j \le i, \\ \frac{b_{r,j}}{b_{r,r+1}} = \frac{b_{r,j}}{b_{r,1}} = (-1)^{j+1} \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} a_k}, & j = 2, 3, \cdots, r. \end{array}$$

Thus, solutions to Equation (1.10) should be

$$x_i = 2n \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{i,j}}{1 + (-1)^{r+1} a_1 a_2 \cdots a_r}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{2.9}$$

The ratio of x_i to x_k in Solution (2.9) is

$$\frac{x_i}{x_k} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{i,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{k,j}}, i, k = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{2.10}$$

According to Expression (2.4) and for $r + 1 \equiv 1(mod\ r)$, we have

$$\max\{|c_{i,j}||j = 1, 2, \cdots, r\} = |c_{i,i+1}| = \prod_{k=1}^{r} a_k, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\begin{array}{rr} \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}} = (-1)^{i+j+1}\frac{1}{\prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} a_k}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1, j > i, \\ \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}} = (-1)^{i+j+1}\frac{1}{\prod_{k=j+1}^{i-1} a_k \prod_{k=i+1}^{r} a_k}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1, j \leq i, \\ \frac{c_{r,j}}{c_{r,r+1}} = \frac{c_{r,j}}{c_{r,1}} = (-1)^{j+1}\frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} a_k}, & j = 2, 3, \cdots, r, \end{array} \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}} = 1 - \frac{1}{a_{i+1}} + \frac{1}{a_{i+1}a_{i+2}} \cdots + (-1)^{r-1}\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{r-1} a_{i+j}} \tag{2.13}$$

where $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $i + j \equiv 1, 2, \cdots, r(\text{mod } r)$ for $i + j = 1, 2, \cdots$.

Thus, solutions to Equation (1.10) can be written as

$$x_i = \frac{2n}{a_i} * \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}{1 + (-1)^{r+1}a_1a_2 \cdots a_r}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{2.14}$$

The ratio of x_i to x_k in Solution (2.14) can be written as

$$\frac{x_i}{x_k} = \frac{a_k}{a_i} * \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{k,j}}, i, k = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{2.15}$$

By using Expression (2.15) and substituting

$$x_r = \frac{a_1}{a_r} * \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{r,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{1,j}} x_1$$

into the first equation of the group of linear equations (1.10) with a matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Form (2.1), we obtain

$$(1 + a_1\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{r,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{1,j}})x_1 = 2n.$$

Hence, in the same way, solutions to Equation (1.10) can be written as

$$x_i = \frac{2n}{1 + a_i\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i-1,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{2.16}$$

The proof of the lemma is completed. □

2.2. **Analysis of solutions of linear equations.**

Lemma 2.2. *By Definition (1.2) and with* $det(\boldsymbol{A}) \neq 1$*, when* $n \to \infty$*, at least one of* x_i *for* $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ *in solutions to Equation (1.10) is not an integer.*

Proof. Based upon Lemma (2.1), let consider Solution (2.2).

When $n \to \infty$, since $a_i > a_{min} > \frac{\sqrt{2n}-1}{4}$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$, there are

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sqrt{2n}-1}{4} \to \infty, \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_{min}} = 0 \texttt{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_i} = 0 \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r.$$

Then according to expressions (2.11-2.13) there are

$$1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} (1 - \frac{1}{a_{i+1}}) \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}} \le \lim_{n\to\infty} (1 - \frac{1}{a_{i+1}} + \frac{1}{a_{i+1}a_{i+2}}) = 1$$

for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{k,j}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{c_{i,i+1}}{c_{k,k+1}} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{c_{k,j}}{c_{k,k+1}}} = 1 \tag{2.17}$$

where $i, k = 1, 2, \cdots, r$.

Thus, according to expressions (2.2), when $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_i = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2n}{1 + a_i} \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{2.18}$$

In Expression (2.18), since $2n$ and $1 + a_i$ are integers, $\frac{2n}{1+a_i}$ is not an integer, otherwise x_i must be a prime factor of n, but it contradicts the fact that x_i should not be a prime factor of n. Thus whether the limit in Expression (2.18) exists or does not exist, x_i should not be an integer.

Hence, when $n \to \infty$, no group of primes q_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ can satisfy Equation (1.10) and at least one of x_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ in solutions to Equation (1.10) is not an integer.

The proof of the lemma is completed. □

Lemma 2.3. *By Definition (1.2) and with $det(\boldsymbol{A}) \ne 1$, when x_i is the solution to Equation (1.10) and its corresponding expected solution is the prime q_{j_i} for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$, then at least an inequality $|x_i - q_{j_i}| > 0$ always holds for any big positive number n greater than a positive number n_0.*

Proof. Based upon Lemma (2.1), let consider values $\varepsilon_i = |x_i - q_{j_i}|$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $\varepsilon_n = \max\{\varepsilon_i | i = 1, 2, \cdots, r\}$.

Since by Lemma (2.2) there is

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_i \ne \lim_{n\to\infty} q_{j_i} \texttt{ or } \lim_{n\to\infty} |x_i - q_{j_i}| \ne 0,$$

then we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_i = \lim_{n\to\infty} |x_i - q_{j_i}| > 0 \texttt{ and } \varepsilon_\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n > 0.$$

Thus for any given small positive value ε smaller than ε_∞, a big positive number n_ε can always be found to obtain at least an inequality $|x_i - q_{j_i}| \ge \varepsilon$ for any big positive number n not smaller than the big positive number n_ε.

Therefore only small values of n can satisfy equations $x_i - q_{j_i} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$. Let define a positive number

$$n_0 = \max\{n | x_i - q_{j_i} = 0 \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r\}.$$

Then for any given small positive value ε smaller than ε_∞, a big positive number n_ε can always be found to obtain at least an inequality $|x_i - q_{j_i}| \ge \varepsilon$ for $n \ge n_\varepsilon > n_0$.

The proof of the lemma is completed. □

3. Theorems of primes

3.1. Main theorem.

Theorem 3.1 (Main theorem)**.** *For every number n greater than a positive number n_0, let q be an odd prime number smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and $d = 2n - q$, then there is always at least an odd number d which does not contain any prime factor smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and must be an odd prime number greater than $2n - \sqrt{2n}$.*

Proof. Let consider any number n greater than a positive number n_0. According to definitions in Sec. (1) and by using the prime set P, take $p_i \in P$ and let an odd number $c_i = 2n - p_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, l$, then we can form a group of equalities as follows

$$p_i + c_i = 2n \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, l. \tag{3.1}$$

When p_i is a prime factor of n where $1 \leq i \leq l$, c_i must be a composite number with a prime factor p_i or equal to p_i, then the corresponding i^{th} equation can be removed from the group of equations (3.1).

Hence, by using the prime set Q, take $q_i \in Q$ and let an odd number $d_i = 2n - q_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, then we can form a group of equalities as follows

$$q_i + d_i = 2n \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, m. \tag{3.2}$$

For $n > n_0 > 15$, there is $q_1 < \sqrt{2n}$. Since q_i is an odd prime number then d_i and n have no common prime factors. Also q_i is neither a prime factor of d_i nor a prime factor of n.

Let assume that every odd number d_i contains prime factors smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ or can be expressed as the product of primes smaller than n, that is, assume that all of odd numbers d_i are composite numbers. Thus, by using expressions (1.7-1.9), we can form a group of linear equations

$$x_i + a_{i,j_i} x_{j_i} = 2n \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{3.3}$$

or in the matrix form as Equation (1.10). By Definition (1.2) $det(\mathbf{A}) \neq 0$.

When all of odd numbers d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ are composite numbers, Equation (1.10) can be solved and solutions to Equation (1.10) should satisfy

$$x_i = q_i \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{3.4}$$

Now, let investigate solutions to equations (3.3) or (1.10) to verify whether the assumption that all of odd numbers d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ are composite numbers, is true or false.

When $rank(\mathbf{A}) = r = 1$, since q_1 is not a prime factor of d_1 and $q_1 < \sqrt{2n} < q_2$, d_1 must be a prime number greater than $2n - \sqrt{2n}$.

Then, since $det(\mathbf{A}) \neq 1$, it can be proved by lemmas (2.1) and (2.2) for the positive number $n \to \infty$ or by lemmas (2.1) and (2.3) for any big positive number $n_0 < n < \infty$, that at least one of x_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ in solutions to Equation (1.10) is neither its corresponding expected solution q_i nor an integer. Hence, solutions x_i can not satisfy Equation (3.4) and at least one of d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ is a prime number greater than $2n - \sqrt{2n}$.

In the investigation of solutions of a group of linear equations (3.3), reductions to absurdity are derived and the assumption that all of odd numbers d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ are composite numbers, is proved false. Hence, it is proved that there is at least an odd number d_i where $1 \leq i \leq r$, which does not contain any prime factor smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and must be an odd prime number greater than $2n - \sqrt{2n}$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

For small values of numbers n greater than 3, the assertion in the theorem has been verified for $2n = N \leq 1.6 \times 10^{10}$ and some higher small ranges up to 4.0×10^{10} by the author. The positive number n_0 has been found being equal to $31,637$.

3.2. **Representation of even numbers.**

Theorem 3.2. *For every number n greater than 1, there are at least a pair of primes p and q which are symmetrical about the number n and satisfy*

$$p = n + x \texttt{ and } q = n - x \tag{3.5}$$

where x is a non-negative integer and $x = (p - q)/2$.

Proof. Let consider any number n greater than 1.

First for $n \leq n_0$ where n_0 is a positive number, we can easily find pairs of primes $p \geq n$ and $q \leq n$ satisfying

$$p = n + x \texttt{ and } q = n - x \texttt{ where } x = (p - q)/2.$$

Actually for small values of numbers n greater than 3, the assertion in the theorem has been verified for $2n = N \leq 1.609 \times 10^{18}$ and some higher small ranges up to 4×10^{18} by T. Oliveira e Silva[1].

Then for $n > n_0$, by Theorem (3.1), we can find at least a pair of primes $q < n$ and $p = 2n - q$ satisfying

$$p = n + x \texttt{ and } q = n - x \texttt{ where } x = (p - q)/2.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.3. *Every even number greater than 2 is a Goldbach number, a number that can be expressed as the sum of two primes.*

Proof. Consider any even number $N = 2n$ greater than 2. By Theorem (3.2), for every number n greater than 1, there are always at least a pair of primes p and q satisfying

$$p = n + x \texttt{ and } q = n - x.$$

Thus, for every even number $N = 2n$ greater than 2, we have

$$N = 2n = p + q,$$

that is, every even number N can be expressed as the sum of two primes.

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Goldbach's conjecture is proved.

□

3.3. **Distribution of primes in short intervals.**

Theorem 3.4. *For every positive number m there is always one prime p between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$.*

Proof. Since for $1 \leq m \leq \sqrt{2n_0}$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, such as the smallest primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for $m = 1, 2, \cdots$ are $2, 5, \cdots$, let consider any number m greater than $\sqrt{2n_0}$.

Let a number n satisfy

$$m^2 \leq 2n - \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } m(m+1) \leq 2n \leq (m+1)^2,$$

then we have

$$n > n_0 \ \texttt{and} \ m < \sqrt{2n} \le m+1.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \ \texttt{and} \ p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, there must be

$$q \le m \ \texttt{and} \ m^2 < p < 2n \le (m+1)^2.$$

The last inequality shows that there is one prime p between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$.

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Legendre's conjecture is proved. □

Theorem 3.5. *For every positive number m there are always two primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$. One is between m^2 and $m(m+1)$, and another is between $m(m+1)$ and $(m+1)^2$.*

Proof. Since for $1 \le m \le \sqrt{2n_0}$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, such as the primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for $m = 1, 2, ...$, are {2,3}, {5,7}, ... , let consider any number m greater than $\sqrt{2n_0}$.

First let a number $n = m(m+1)/2$, then we have

$$n > n_0 \ \texttt{and} \ m < \sqrt{2n} < m+1.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \ \texttt{and} \ p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Since q and p are integers, there must be

$$q \le m \ \texttt{and} \ p = 2n - q \ge 2n - m \ge m(m+1) - m = m^2.$$

Since p is a prime, then there must be

$$q \le m \ \texttt{and} \ m^2 < p < 2n \le m(m+1).$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between m^2 and $m(m+1)$.

Next let the number n satisfy

$$m(m+2) \le 2n \le (m+1)^2,$$

then we have

$$n > n_0 \ \texttt{and} \ m < \sqrt{2n} \le m+1.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \ \texttt{and} \ p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Since q and p are integers, there must be

$$q \le m \ \texttt{and} \ p = 2n - q \ge 2n - m \ge m(m+2) - m = m(m+1).$$

Since p is a prime, then there must be

$$q \le m \ \texttt{and} \ m(m+1) < p < 2n \le (m+1)^2.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between $m(m+1)$ and $(m+1)^2$.

Thus, for every positive number m there are two primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$. One is between m^2 and $m(m+1)$, and another is between $m(m+1)$ and $(m+1)^2$.

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Oppermann's conjecture is proved. □

Theorem 3.6. *For every positive number m there are always three primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$. The first one is between m^3 and $m^2(m+1)$, the second one is between $m^2(m+1)$ and $m(m+1)^2$, and the third one is between $m(m+1)^2$ and $(m+1)^3$.*

Proof. Since for $1 \leq m \leq \sqrt[3]{2n_0}$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, such as the primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$ for $m = 1, 2, \cdots$ are {2,3,5}, {11,13,19}, ... , let consider any number m greater than $\sqrt[3]{2n_0}$.

First let a number $n = m^2(m+1)/2$, then we have $n > n_0$ and

$$2n - \sqrt{2n} = m^2(m+1) - m\sqrt{m+1} > m^3.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q \leq m\sqrt{m+1} \texttt{ and } m^3 < p < 2n = m^2(m+1).$$

The inequalities show that there is a prime p between m^3 and $m^2(m+1)$.

Next let the number $n = m(m+1)^2/2$, then we have $n > n_0$ and

$$2n - \sqrt{2n} = m(m+1)^2 - \sqrt{m}(m+1) > m^2(m+1).$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q \leq \sqrt{m}(m+1) \texttt{ and } m^2(m+1) < p < 2n = m(m+1)^2.$$

The inequalities show that there is a prime p between $m^2(m+1)$ and $m(m+1)^2$.

Thirdly let the number n satisfy

$$m(m+1)^2 + m(m+2) \leq 2n \leq (m+1)^3,$$

then we have $n > n_0$ and

$$2n - \sqrt{2n} \geq m(m+1)^2 + m(m+2) - \sqrt{m+1}(m+1) > m(m+1)^2.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q \leq \sqrt{m+1}(m+1) \texttt{ and } m(m+1)^2 < p < 2n \leq (m+1)^3.$$

The inequalities show that there is a prime p between $m(m+1)^2$ and $(m+1)^3$.

Thus, for every positive number m there are always three primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$. The first one is between m^3 and $m^2(m+1)$, the second one is between $m^2(m+1)$ and $m(m+1)^2$, and the third one is between $m(m+1)^2$ and $(m+1)^3$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.7. *For every positive number m there are always k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$ where k is a positive integer greater than 1. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, there is always one prime between $m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}$ and $m^{k-i}(m+1)^i$.*

Proof. According to theorems (3.5-3.6), the theorem is proved true for $k = 2, 3$. Since for every k we can always choose a suitable value of m to make a number $n > n_0$ where n_0 is a positive number, such as for $k = 2, 3, \cdots$, we can choose $m = [\sqrt{2n_0}] + 1, [\sqrt[3]{2n_0}] + 1, \cdots$, let consider any number m which can make the number $n > n_0$.

For $k > 2$ and $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, let the number $n = m^{k-i}(m+1)^i/2$, since

$$m^{(k-i)/2} > (m+1)^{1-i/2} \texttt{ for } k > 2$$

then we have

$$m^{k-i}(m+1)^{i-1} - m^{(k-i)/2}(m+1)^{i/2} > 0$$

and

$$2n - \sqrt{2n} = m^{k-i}(m+1)^i - m^{(k-i)/2}(m+1)^{i/2} > m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q \leq m^{(k-i)/2}(m+1)^{i/2} \texttt{ and } m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1} < p < 2n = m^{k-i}(m+1)^i.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between $m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}$ and $m^{k-i}(m+1)^i$.

Thus, for every positive number m there are k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, there is one prime between $m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}$ and $m^{k-i}(m+1)^i$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.8. *There are at least two prime numbers between p_i^2 and $p_i p_{i+1}$, and there are also at least two prime numbers between $p_i p_{i+1}$ and p_{i+1}^2, for $i > 1$, where p_i is the i^{th} prime number.*

Proof. Since $p_{i+1} \geq p_i + 2$ and $p_i \leq p_{i+1} - 2$, we have

$$p_i p_{i+1} \geq p_i(p_i + 2) = p_i^2 + 2p_i = (p_i + 1)^2 - 1$$

and

$$p_i p_{i+1} \leq (p_{i+1} - 2)p_{i+1} = p_{i+1}^2 - 2p_{i+1} = (p_{i+1} - 1)^2 - 1.$$

By Theorem (3.5), there are always two primes between p_i^2 and $(p_i + 1)^2$. Since $p_i(p_i + 2)$ is a composite number, then there are always two primes between p_i^2 and $p_i p_{i+1}$.

Also by Theorem (3.5), there are always two primes between $(p_{i+1} - 1)^2$ and p_{i+1}^2. Since $(p_{i+1} - 2)p_{i+1}$ is a composite number, then there are always two primes between $p_i p_{i+1}$ and p_{i+1}^2.

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Hanssner's conjecture is proved. □

Theorem 3.9. *There are at least four prime numbers between p_i^2 and p_{i+1}^2, for $i > 1$, where p_i is the i^{th} prime number.*

Proof. Since $p_i < p_i + 1 < p_{i+1}$, there is a square $(p_i + 1)^2$ between p_i^2 and p_{i+1}^2.

By Theorem (3.5), there are always two primes between p_i^2 and $(p_i + 1)^2$, and also there are always two primes between $(p_i + 1)^2$ and p_{i+1}^2. Thus, there are always at least four prime numbers between p_i^2 and p_{i+1}^2.

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Brocard's conjecture is proved. □

Theorem 3.10. *For every positive number* m *there are always four primes between* m^3 *and* $(m+1)^3$.

Proof. Since for $1 \le m \le \sqrt[3]{2n_0}$ we can easily verify the theorem true, such as the primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$ for $m = 1, 2, \cdots$ are {2,3,5,7}, {11,13,19,23}, ..., let consider any number m greater than $\sqrt[3]{2n_0}$.

Since for any number m greater than 5, there is always a number s satisfying $m^{3/2} \le s \le (m+1)^{3/2} - 2$. Then there are $m^3 \le s^2$ and $(s+2)^2 \le (m+1)^3$.

By Theorem (3.5), there are always two primes between s^2 and $(s+1)^2$, and also there are always two primes between $(s+1)^2$ and $(s+2)^2$. Thus, there are always at least four prime numbers between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.11. *For every positive number* $m \ge a^k - 1$ *where* a *and* k *are integers greater than 1, if there are at least* S_k *primes between* m^k *and* $(m+1)^k$*, then there are always* S_{k+1} *primes between* m^{k+1} *and* $(m+1)^{k+1}$ *where* $S_{k+1} = aS_k$.

Proof. Since for any number $m \ge a^k - 1$, there is always a number s satisfying $m^{1+1/k} \le s \le (m+1)^{1+1/k} - a$. Then there are $m^{k+1} \le s^k$ and $(s+a)^k \le (m+1)^{k+1}$.

Since there are at least S_k primes between s^k and $(s+1)^k$ for $s \ge m \ge a^k - 1$, then there are also at least S_k primes between $(s+i)^k$ and $(s+i+1)^k$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, a-1$. Thus, there are always S_{k+1} primes between m^{k+1} and $(m+1)^{k+1}$ where $S_{k+1} = aS_k$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.12. *There is always a prime* p *between* $m - m^\theta$ *and* m *where* $\theta = 1/2$ *and* m *is a positive number greater than a positive number* $2n_0$.

Proof. Let a number $n = (m+1)/2$. Then for $m > 2n_0$ we have $n > n_0$. By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Since $1 + \sqrt{2n-1} > \sqrt{2n}$ and the prime number $q \ge 3$, we have

$$2n - 1 - \sqrt{2n-1} < 2n - \sqrt{2n} < p < 2n - 1.$$

First for $m = 2n - 1$ let $m - m^\theta = 2n - 1 - \sqrt{2n-1} = m - \sqrt{m}$, then we have $\theta = 1/2$ and

$$q < m^\theta \texttt{ and } m - m^\theta < p < m.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between $m - m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is an odd number greater than m_0.

Next for $m = 2n$ let $m - m^\theta = 2n - \sqrt{2n} = m - \sqrt{m}$, then we have $\theta = 1/2$ and

$$q < m^\theta \texttt{ and } m - m^\theta < p < m.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between $m - m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is an even number greater than m_0.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.13. *There is always a prime* p *between* m *and* $m + m^\theta$ *where* $\theta = 1/2$ *and* m *is a positive number greater than a positive number* $2n_0$.

Proof. Let consider any positive number m greater than $2n_0$.

Let a number n satisfy

$$m \leq 2n - \sqrt{2n} < m + 1,$$

then we have $n > n_0$ for $m > 2n_0$ and

$$\sqrt{m + 1/4} + 1/2 \leq \sqrt{2n} < \sqrt{m + 5/4} + 1/2$$

and

$$\sqrt{m + 1/4} + m + 1/2 \leq 2n < \sqrt{m + 5/4} + m + 3/2.$$

Let consider the equation

$$2n = m + m^{\theta} + f(m, x, y) - \sqrt{m} \quad \texttt{where} \quad f(m, x, y) = \sqrt{m + x} + y. \tag{3.6}$$

When substituting $f(m, 1/4, 1/2)$ into Equation (3.6), we obtain

$$m^{\theta} \geq \sqrt{m} \quad \texttt{and} \quad \theta \geq 1/2$$

and when substituting $f(m, 5/4, 3/2)$ into Equation (3.6), we obtain

$$m^{\theta} < \sqrt{m} \quad \texttt{and} \quad \theta < 1/2.$$

Thus, we can always choose a suitable value of $f(m, x, y)$ to get

$$m^{\theta} = \sqrt{m} \quad \texttt{and} \quad \theta = 1/2.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \quad \texttt{and} \quad p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Since any odd prime q is greater than 2, then $p \leq 2n - 3$. For $1/4 \leq x \leq 5/4$ and $1/2 \leq y \leq 3/2$, since $f(m, x, y) - \sqrt{m} \leq 2$, then the values of θ are in a small neighborhood of $1/2$ and the values of $m + m^{\theta}$ are in the region $[2n - 2, 2n)$ and greater than the upper bound of the prime p, that is, $p \leq 2n - 3$. Hence we have

$$m < p < m + m^{\theta} < 2n.$$

The inequality shows that there is a prime p between m and $m + m^{\theta}$ where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is a positive number greater than m_0.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.14. *The inequality* $\sqrt{p_{i+1}} - \sqrt{p_i} < 1$ *holds for all* $i > 0$*, where* p_i *is the* i^{th} *prime number.*

Proof. Since for $1 \leq i \leq k$ where $p_k \geq 2n_0$ we can easily verify the theorem true, let consider any positive number i greater than k.

The inequality $\sqrt{p_{i+1}} - \sqrt{p_i} < 1$ can be written as

$$g_i = p_{i+1} - p_i < 2\sqrt{p_i} + 1.$$

Let a number $n = (p_{i+1} + 1)/2$, then we have $n > n_0$ where n_0 is a positive number.

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \quad \texttt{and} \quad p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Since $p_i \geq p$, then we obtain

$$g_i = p_{i+1} - p_i < 2n - p < \sqrt{2n} = \sqrt{p_{i+1} + 1}$$
$$< \sqrt{p_{i+1}} + 1 < \sqrt{2p_i} + 1.$$

Also by Theorem (3.13), let a number $m = p_i$ greater than $2n_0$, then there is always a prime p between p_i and $p_i + \sqrt{p_i}$, therefore we obtain

$$g_i = p_{i+1} - p_i < \sqrt{p_i}.$$

Thus we have

$$g_i = p_{i+1} - p_i < 2\sqrt{p_i} + 1 \texttt{ and } \sqrt{p_{i+1}} - \sqrt{p_i} < 1.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Andrica's conjecture is proved. □

Theorem 3.15. *There is always one prime number p between km and $(k+1)m$ where m is a positive number greater than 1 and $1 \leq k < m$.*

Proof. Since for $2 \leq m \leq n_0$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, let consider any positive number m greater than n_0.

Since $m = (k+1)m - km \geq \sqrt{(k+1)m}$ for $1 \leq k < m$, thus we can find a number n satisfying $km \leq 2n - \sqrt{2n}$ and $2n \leq (k+1)m$. Then for $1 \leq k < m$ and $m > n_0$ we have $n > n_0$ and

$$m = (k+1)m - km \geq 2n - (2n - \sqrt{2n}) = \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ or } m \geq \sqrt{2n}.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \leq m \texttt{ and } km \leq 2n - \sqrt{2n} < p < 2n \leq (k+1)m.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between km and $(k+1)m$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.16. *If the numbers $1, 2, 3, \cdots, m^2$ with $m > 1$ are arranged in m rows each containing m numbers:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 1, & 2, & 3, & \cdots, & m \\ m+1, & m+2, & m+3, & \cdots, & 2m \\ 2m+1, & 2m+2, & 2m+3, & \cdots, & 3m \\ \cdots, & \cdots, & \cdots, & \cdots, & \cdots \\ (m-1)m+1, & (m-1)m+2, & (m-1)m+3, & \cdots, & m^2 \end{array} \tag{3.7}$$

then each row contains at least one prime number.

Proof. The first row of Table (3.7) contains of course ($m > 1$) prime number 2.

By Theorem (3.15) for a positive number k smaller than m, there is always a prime between km and $(k+1)m$, which means that the $(k+1)^{th}$ row of Table (3.7) contains at least one prime number.

Thus, each row of Table (3.7) contains at least one prime number.

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Sierpinski's conjecture is proved. □

Theorem 3.17. *Between any two triangular numbers, there is at least one prime number. Namely, if we arrange natural numbers in rows in such a manner that in* *the m^{th} row we put m consecutive natural numbers, i.e. if we form the table*

$$\begin{array}{lllll} 1 & & & & \\ 2, & 3 & & & \\ 4, & 5, & 6 & & \\ 7, & 8, & 9, & 10 & \\ 11, & 12, & 13, & 14, & 15 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{array} \tag{3.8}$$

then each but the first of its rows contains at least one prime number.

Proof. Since for $2 \leq m \leq \sqrt{2n_0}$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, such as the smallest primes in the m^{th} row of Table (3.8) for $m = 2, 3, ...$ are 2, 5, ..., let consider any number m greater than $\sqrt{2n_0}$.

Since the $(m-1)^{th}$ and m^{th} triangular numbers are $(m-1)m/2$ and $m(m+1)/2$, respectively, the difference of the m^{th} and $(m-1)^{th}$ triangular numbers is

$$m = m(m+1)/2 - (m-1)m/2 > \sqrt{m(m+1)/2}.$$

Thus, we can find a number n satisfying $(m-1)m/2 \leq 2n - \sqrt{2n}$ and $2n \leq m(m+1)/2$. Then for $m > k$ we have $n > n_0$ and

$$m = m(m+1)/2 - (m-1)m/2 \geq 2n - (2n - \sqrt{2n}) = \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ or } m > \sqrt{2n}.$$

By Theorem (3.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n - q > 2n - \sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q < \sqrt{2n} < m \texttt{ and } (m-1)m/2 < p < 2n \leq m(m+1)/2.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between $(m-1)m/2$ and $m(m+1)/2$, i.e. between any two triangular numbers, there is at least one prime number.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

References

1. Wapedia - Wiki, *Goldbach's conjecture.*
2. Weisstein, Eric W., *Goldbach Conjecture.* MathWorld.
3. J. R. Chen, *On the representation of a larger even integer as the sum of a prime and the product of at most two primes.* Sci. Sinica 16 (1973), pp. 157-176.
4. H. L. Montgomery, R. C. Vaughan, *The exceptional set in Goldbach's problem. Collection of articles in memory of Jurii Vladimirovich Linnik.* Acta arithmetica 27 (1975): pp. 353-370.
5. D. R. Heath-Brown, J. C. Puchta, *Integers represented as a sum of primes and powers of two.* The Asian Journal of Mathematics, 6 (2002), no. 3, pp. 535-565.
6. J. Pintz, I. Z. Ruzsa, *On Linnik's approximation to Goldbach's problem.* I, Acta Arithmetica, 109(2003), pp. 169-194.
7. P. Ribenboim, *The Little Book of Bigger Primes.* Springer-Verlag New York Inc. 1991.
8. W. Sierpinski, *Elementary Theory of Numbers.* Hafner, New York, 1964(2nd edition, North-Holland, Amsterdam,1988).
9. Richard K. Guy, *Unsolved Problems in Number Theory.* New York: Springer-Verlag 2004: C1
10. Wapedia - Wiki, *Legendre's conjecture.*
11. Weisstein, Eric W., *Legendre's conjecture.* MathWorld.
12. J. R. Chen, *On the Distribution of Almost Primes in an Interval.* Sci. Sinica 18, 611-627, 1975.

13. G. H. Hardy, and W. M. Wright, *Unsolved Problems Concerning Primes.* 2.8 and Appendix 3 in An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, 5th ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, pp. 19 and 415-416, 1979.
14. P. Ribenboim, *The New Book of Prime Number Records.* 3rd ed. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 132-134 and 206-208, 1996.
15. H. Iwaniec, and J. Pintz, *Primes in Short Intervals.* Monatsh. f. Math. 98, 115-143, 1984.
16. N. J. A. Sloane, Sequences A007491/M1389 and A014085 in *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.*
17. W. H. Mills, *A Prime-Representing Function.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 53, 604, 1947.
18. D. Andrica, *Note on a Conjecture in Prime Number Theory.* Studia Univ. Babes-Bolyai Math. 31, 44-48, 1986.
19. Wapedia - Wiki, *Oppermann's conjecture.*
20. Wapedia - Wiki, *Brocard's conjecture.*

Part 2. On the representation of odd numbers as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime and the distribution of primes in short intervals

4. Introduction

4.1. Lemoine's conjecture. Lemoine's conjecture, also known as Levy's conjecture, is one of the unsolved problems in number theory and in all of mathematics. It states that all odd integers greater than 5 can be represented as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime[1-9]. To put it algebraically, $2n+1=p+2q$ always has a solution in primes p and q (not necessarily distinct) for $n>2$. The Lemoine's conjecture is similar to but stronger than Goldbach's weak conjecture. For small values of odd numbers N, the Lemoine's conjecture has been verified for $N \leq 10^9$ by Corbitt[3].

4.2. Legendre's conjecture. Legendre's conjecture is one of Landau's problems (1912). It states: There is a prime number p between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for every positive number m(Hardy and Wright 1979, p. 415[11,13]; Ribenboim 1996, pp. 397-398[11,14]).

Although it is not known if there is always a prime p between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$, Chen (1975) has shown that a number P which is either a prime or semiprime does always satisfy this inequality[11,12]. Moreover, there is always a prime between $m-m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 23/42$ (Iwaniec and Pintz 1984[11,15]; Hardy and Wright 1979, p. 415[11,13]).

The smallest primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for $m=1,2,...$, are 2, 5, 11, 17, 29, 37, 53, 67, 83, ... (Sloane's A007491)[16]. The numbers of primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for $m=1,2,...$ are given by 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 4, 3, 4, ... (Sloane's A014085)[16].

4.3. Works in this paper. The representation of odd numbers as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime and the distribution of primes in short intervals were investigated and a main theorem was given out and proved in this paper, which states: For every number n greater than a positive number n_0, let q be an odd prime number smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and $d=2n+1-2q$, then there is always at least an odd number d which does not contain any odd prime factor smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and must be a prime number greater than $2n+1-2\sqrt{2n}$.

The proof of the main theorem is based upon the fundamental theorem of Arithmetic and the theory of Linear Algebra, and its main idea is that if all of odd numbers d are composite numbers, a group of linear equations can be formed for a group of primes smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$, which should be solutions of the group of linear equations, so when a contradiction between the expectation and the actual results of the solutions is obtained, the main theorem will be proved.

Based upon the main theorem, it was proved that for every number n greater than 2, there are always at least a pair of primes p and q so that all odd integers greater than 5 can be represented as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime. Hence, the Lemoine's conjecture was proved.

Also based upon the main theorem, theorems of the distribution of primes in short intervals were given out and proved.

1. It was proved that for every positive number m there is always a prime between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$. Hence the Legendre's conjecture was proved.

2. It was proved that for every positive number m there are always three primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$. The first one is between m^3 and $m^2(m+1)$, the second one is between $m^2(m+1)$ and $m(m+1)^2$, and the third one is between $m(m+1)^2$ and $(m+1)^3$. Hence the theorem can be used to determine the Mills' constant[17].

3. It was proved that for every positive number m there are always k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$ where k is a positive integer greater than 2. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, there is always a prime between $m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}$ and $m^{k-i}(m+1)^i$.

4. It was proved that for every positive number $m \geq a^k - 1$ where a is an integer greater than 1 and k is an integer greater than 2, if there are at least S_k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$, then there are always S_{k+1} primes between m^{k+1} and $(m+1)^{k+1}$ where $S_{k+1} = aS_k$.

5. It was proved that there is always a prime between $m - 2m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is a positive number greater than 4.

6. It was proved that there is always a prime between m and $m + 2m^\theta$ where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is a positive number.

7. It was proved that the inequality $\sqrt{p_{i+1}} - \sqrt{p_i} < 1$ holds for all $i > 0$, where p_i is the i^{th} prime number. Hence the Andrica's conjecture was proved[18].

.

5. Definitions

5.1. **Sets of primes.** Let n denote a positive number greater than 2, an odd number $N = 2n+1$ and a set of primes P denote all odd primes smaller than or equal to the number n where

$$P = \{p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_l\}, 3 = p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_l < n. \tag{5.1}$$

By the fundamental theorem of Arithmetic, a positive number $N = 2n+1$ can be written as

$$N = 2n+1 = p_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} p_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_{i_s}^{\alpha_s} p_{i_{s+1}}^{\alpha_{s+1}} p_{i_{s+2}}^{\alpha_{s+2}} \cdots p_{i_t}^{\alpha_t} \tag{5.2}$$

for $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_s < i_{s+1} < i_{s+2} < \cdots < i_t \leq l$ where $p_{i_s} \leq n < p_{i_{s+1}}$, $p_{i_j} \in P$ for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, s$, all α_j are positive integers for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, t$.

Then, let P_s and Q denote two subsets of P where

$$\begin{aligned} P_s = \{\} = \phi \subset P \qquad & \texttt{for } s = 0, \\ P_s = \{p_{i_1}, p_{i_2}, \cdots, p_{i_s}\} \subset P \qquad & \texttt{for } s > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$Q = P \backslash P_s = \{q_1, q_2, \cdots, q_m\} \subset P, \tag{5.4}$$

$$3 \leq q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_m < n.$$

Let take the first $r < m$ elements of Q to form a prime set Q_r, that is

$$Q_r = \{q_1, q_2, \cdots, q_r\} \subset Q \tag{5.5}$$

where if $\sqrt{2n} < q_1$ then $r = 1$ else

$$3 \leq q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_r < \sqrt{2n} < q_{r+1} < n$$

where the number r is dependent of the number n. Generally speaking, the bigger the number n, the bigger the number r is. For examples, when $n = 2^3$ or $n = 2^4$, there is $r = 1$, when $n = 2^5$, there is $r = 2$, $\cdots$, and when $2n + 1 = 3 * 5$ or $2n + 1 = 3^3$, there is $r = 1$, when $2n + 1 = 3^4$, there is $r = 2$, $\cdots$.

Let consider the following equation

$$a_{min} q_{r+1} + 2q_r = 2n + 1$$

where a_{min} is a real. Since there are at most two primes which are prime factors of the number $2n+1$ and greater than $\sqrt{n}$ between q_r and q_{r+1}, we have $q_{r+1} < 2^3 q_r$ and

$$a_{min} = \frac{2n + 1 - 2q_r}{q_{r+1}} > \frac{2n + 1 - 2q_r}{2^3 q_r} > \frac{\sqrt{2n} - 2}{8}. \tag{5.6}$$

5.2. **Linear equations.** Let make a main assumption which may be called Lemoine's anti-conjecture.

Definition 5.1 (Lemoine's anti-conjecture)**.** There is at least an odd number greater than 5, which can not be expressed as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime.

According to the Lemoine's anti-conjecture (5.1) and by using the prime set Q, take $q_i \in Q$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ and let an odd number $d_i = 2n + 1 - 2q_i$, then all of odd numbers d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ should be composite numbers.

By the fundamental theorem of Arithmetic, for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, we can write

$$d_i = q_{i,1}^{\alpha_{i,1}} q_{i,2}^{\alpha_{i,2}} \cdots q_{i,m_i}^{\alpha_{i,m_i}} \tag{5.7}$$

where m_i is the sum of different prime factors of d_i and $\alpha_{i,1}, \alpha_{i,2} \cdots \alpha_{i,m_i}$ are positive integers. Since d_i and $2n+1$ have no common prime factors, there are $q_{i,k} \in Q$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m_i$.

For $j_i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$, when $q_{j_i} \in Q_r$ is equal to $q_{i,k}$ which is a prime factor of d_i, let denote

$$a_{i,j_i} = d_i / q_{j_i} = q_{i,1}^{\alpha_{i,1}} q_{i,2}^{\alpha_{i,2}} \cdots q_{i,k}^{\alpha_{i,k}-1} \cdots q_{i,m_i}^{\alpha_{i,m_i}} \tag{5.8}$$

where since $q_{j_i} \leq q_r < q_{r+1}$ for $j_i \leq r$,

$$\frac{2n + 1 - 2q_r}{q_{j_i}} - a_{min} = \frac{2n + 1 - 2q_r}{q_{j_i}} - \frac{2n + 1 - 2q_r}{q_{r+1}} = (2n + 1 - 2q_r)\frac{q_{r+1} - q_{j_i}}{q_{j_i} q_{r+1}} > 0$$

and

$$\frac{2n + 1 - 2q_{r+1}}{q_{j_i}} - a_{min} \geq \frac{2n + 1 - 2q_{r+1}}{q_r} - \frac{2n + 1 - 2q_r}{q_{r+1}}$$

$$= (2n + 1 - 2q_{r+1} - 2q_r)\frac{q_{r+1} - q_r}{q_r q_{r+1}} > 0 \texttt{ for } n \geq q_{r+1} + q_r,$$

then there are $a_{i,j_i} > a_{min}$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $1 \leq j_i \leq r$.

Hence, we can form a group of equalities as follows

$$2q_i + a_{i,j_i} q_{j_i} = 2n + 1 \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, m \texttt{ and } 1 \le j_i \le r \tag{5.9}$$

where since q_i is not a prime factor of the number $2n+1$ then $q_i \ne q_{j_i}$.

Definition 5.2 (Linear equations)**.** Based upon the Lemoine's anti-conjecture (5.1) and by using the prime set Q_r and expressions (5.7-5.9), let define a group of linear equations in the matrix form

$$\mathbf{A}x = b \tag{5.10}$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & \cdots & a_{1,j_1} & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & \cdots & a_{2,j_2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_{r,j_r} & \cdots & 2 \end{bmatrix}, b = (2n+1) \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}, x = \begin{Bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_r \end{Bmatrix}$$

where all diagonal elements $a_{i,i} = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and there is just one non-diagonal and non-zero element a_{i,j_i} in every row of the matrix $\mathbf{A}$. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $1 \le j_i \le r$ and $j_i \ne i$, a_{i,j_i} is an odd number greater than 1 and satisfies $a_{i,j_i} > a_{min}$, a_{i,j_i} and $2n+1$ have no common prime factors, and $q_i \in Q_r$ is neither a prime factor of a_{i,j_i} nor a prime factor of $2n+1$.

Since $1 \le |det(\mathbf{A})| \le |2^r + (-1)^{r+1} a_{1,j_1} a_{2,j_2} \cdots a_{r,j_r}|$, there is $det(\mathbf{A}) \ne 0$. Therefore let $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ denote the inverse and adjoint matrix of $\mathbf{A}$, respectively.

Let make a new and equivalent definition of the Lemoine's conjecture:

Definition 5.3 (Lemoine's conjecture)**.** For any odd number greater than 5, by Definition (5.2), at least one group of primes $q \in Q$ do not satisfy Equation (5.10).

In other words, at least for one group of primes $q \in Q$, a corresponding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (5.2) can not be formed to let the group of primes $q \in Q$ satisfy Equation (5.10) or some of non-diagonal and non-zero elements a_{i,j_i} of the corresponding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (5.2) can not be odd numbers greater than 1.

It is easy to prove that Definition (5.3) is equivalent to the normal definition of the Lemoine's conjecture.

Proof. First, if any odd number greater than 5 can be expressed as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime, then for the odd number, at least for one group of primes $q \in Q$, a corresponding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (5.2) can not be formed to let the group of primes $q \in Q$ satisfy Equation (5.10).

Next, for any odd number greater than 5, if at least for one group of primes $q \in Q$, a corresponding matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (5.2) can not be formed to let the group of primes $q \in Q$ satisfy Equation (5.10), then the odd number can be expressed as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime.

The proof of the equivalence of Definition (5.3) to the normal definition of the Lemoine's conjecture is completed. □

Thus Definition (5.3) relates the Lemoine's conjecture to solutions of Equation (5.10). According to the new and equivalent definition of the Lemoine's conjecture (5.3) and by proving that the group of primes $q_i \in Q_r$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ do not satisfy Equation (5.10), we can prove the Lemoine's conjecture that all odd integers greater than 5 can be represented as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime.

6. Lemmas of linear equations

6.1. **Solutions of linear equations.**

Lemma 6.1. *By Definition (5.2) and with det($\boldsymbol{A}$) $\neq 2^r$, the matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ or at least one of its sub-matrixes can be written as*

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a_{1,r} \\ a_{2,1} & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{3,2} & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a_{r,r-1} & 2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6.1}$$

For a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ in Form (6.1), solutions to Equation (5.10) are

$$x_i = \frac{2n+1}{2 + a_i \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i-1,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r \tag{6.2}$$

where $i - 1 \equiv r, 1, \cdots, r-1 (mod\ r)$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$,

$$a_1 = a_{2,1}, a_2 = a_{3,2}, \cdots, a_r = a_{1,r} \tag{6.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i,i} &= a_i b_{i,i} = a_i 2^{r-1}, & i &= 1, 2, \cdots, r, \\ c_{i,j} &= a_i b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j} 2^{r+j-i-1} \prod_{k=j}^{i} a_k, & j &< i = 2, 3, \cdots, r, \\ c_{i,j} &= a_i b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j+r} 2^{j-i-1} \prod_{k=1}^{i} a_k \prod_{k=j}^{r} a_k, & i &< j = 2, 3, \cdots, r, \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

where $b_{i,j}$ are elements of $\boldsymbol{B}$ which is the adjoint matrix of $\boldsymbol{A}$.

Proof. By exchanging its rows and columns, the matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Definition (5.2) can be written as one of three forms.

The first form of $\mathbf{A}$ is Form (6.1).

The second form of $\mathbf{A}$ is

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} & \mathbf{A}_s & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & a_{s+1,j_{s+1}} & \cdots & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & a_{s+2,j_{s+2}} & \cdots & \cdots & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & 0 \\ \cdots & a_{r,j_r} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{6.5}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_s$ is a sub-matrix of $\mathbf{A}$ and similar to Form (6.1). Thus, we can only investigate the first form of $\mathbf{A}$.

The third form of $\mathbf{A}$ is

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{A}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{A}_m \end{bmatrix}$$

where any one of $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_m$ is a sub-matrix of $\mathbf{A}$ and similar to Form (6.1) or (6.5). Thus, we can only investigate the first form of $\mathbf{A}$.

Hence, without lose of generality, let consider solutions of Equation (5.10) with a matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Form (6.1).

Then, we obtain

$$det(\mathbf{A}) = 2^r + (-1)^{r+1} a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{r-1} a_r \tag{6.6}$$

where $a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_r$ are defined by Expression (6.3), and

$$\mathbf{B} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc} 2^{r-1} & b_{1,2} & \cdots & b_{1,r} \\ b_{2,1} & 2^{r-1} & \cdots & b_{2,r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{r,1} & b_{r,2} & \cdots & 2^{r-1} \end{array} \right] \tag{6.7}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rl} b_{i,i} = 2^{r-1}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r, \\ b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j} 2^{r+j-i-1} \prod_{k=j}^{i-1} a_k, & j < i = 2, 3, \cdots, r, \\ b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j+r} 2^{j-i-1} \prod_{k=1}^{i-1} a_k \prod_{k=j}^{r} a_k, & i < j = 2, 3, \cdots, r. \end{array} \tag{6.8}$$

According to Expression (6.8) and for $r + 1 \equiv 1(mod\ r)$, we have

$$\max\{|b_{i,j}||j = 1, 2, \cdots, r\} = |b_{i,i+1}|, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rl} \frac{b_{i,j}}{b_{i,i+1}} = (-1)^{i+j+1} \frac{2^{j-i-1}}{\prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} a_k}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1, j > i, \\ \frac{b_{i,j}}{b_{i,i+1}} = (-1)^{i+j+1} \frac{2^{r+j-i-1}}{\prod_{k=j+1}^{i-1} a_k \prod_{k=i+1}^{r} a_k}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1, j \leq i, \\ \frac{b_{r,j}}{b_{r,r+1}} = \frac{b_{r,j}}{b_{r,1}} = (-1)^{j+1} \frac{2^{j-1}}{\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} a_k}, & j = 2, 3, \cdots, r. \end{array}$$

Thus, solutions to Equation (5.10) should be

$$x_i = (2n+1) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{i,j}}{2^r + (-1)^{r+1} a_1 a_2 \cdots a_r}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{6.9}$$

The ratio of x_i to x_k in Solution (6.9) is

$$\frac{x_i}{x_k} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{i,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{k,j}}, i, k = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{6.10}$$

According to Expression (6.4) and for $r + 1 \equiv 1(mod\ r)$, we have

$$\max\{|c_{i,j}||j = 1, 2, \cdots, r\} = |c_{i,i+1}| = \prod_{k=1}^{r} a_k, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r, \tag{6.11}$$

$$\begin{array}{rl} \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}} = (-1)^{i+j+1} \frac{2^{j-i-1}}{\prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} a_k}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1, j > i, \\ \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}} = (-1)^{i+j+1} \frac{2^{r+j-i-1}}{\prod_{k=j+1}^{i-1} a_k \prod_{k=i+1}^{r} a_k}, & i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1, j \leq i, \\ \frac{c_{r,j}}{c_{r,r+1}} = \frac{c_{r,j}}{c_{r,1}} = (-1)^{j+1} \frac{2^{j-1}}{\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} a_k}, & j = 2, 3, \cdots, r, \end{array} \tag{6.12}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}} = 1 - \frac{2}{a_{i+1}} + \frac{2^2}{a_{i+1} a_{i+2}} \cdots + (-1)^{r-1} \frac{2^{r-1}}{\prod_{j=1}^{r-1} a_{i+j}} \tag{6.13}$$

where $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $i + j \equiv 1, 2, \cdots, r(mod\ r)$ for $i + j = 1, 2, \cdots$.

Thus, solutions to Equation (5.10) can be written as

$$x_i = \frac{2n+1}{a_i} * \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}{2^r + (-1)^{r+1} a_1 a_2 \cdots a_r}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{6.14}$$

The ratio of x_i to x_k in Solution (6.14) can be written as

$$\frac{x_i}{x_k} = \frac{a_k}{a_i} * \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{k,j}}, i, k = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{6.15}$$

By using Expression (6.15) and substituting

$$x_r = \frac{a_1}{a_r} * \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{r,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{1,j}} x_1$$

into the first equation of the group of linear equations (5.10) with a matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in Form (6.1), we obtain

$$(2 + a_1 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{r,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{1,j}}) x_1 = 2n + 1.$$

Hence, in the same way, solutions to Equation (5.10) can be written as

$$x_i = \frac{2n+1}{2 + a_i \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i-1,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{6.16}$$

The proof of the lemma is completed. □

6.2. **Analysis of solutions of linear equations.**

Lemma 6.2. *By Definition (5.2) and with* $det(\boldsymbol{A}) \neq 2^r$, *when* $n \to \infty$, *at least one of* x_i *for* $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ *in solutions to Equation (5.10) is not an integer.*

Proof. Based upon Lemma (6.1), let consider solutions (6.2).

When $n \to \infty$, since $a_i > a_{min} > \frac{\sqrt{2n}-2}{8}$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$, there are

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sqrt{2n}-2}{8} \to \infty, \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_{min}} = 0 \texttt{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_i} = 0 \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r.$$

Then according to expressions (6.11-6.13) there are

$$1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} (1 - \frac{2}{a_{i+1}}) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} (1 - \frac{2}{a_{i+1}} + \frac{2^2}{a_{i+1}a_{i+2}}) = 1$$

for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{i,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} c_{k,j}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{c_{i,i+1}}{c_{k,k+1}} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{c_{i,j}}{c_{i,i+1}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{c_{k,j}}{c_{k,k+1}}} = 1 \tag{6.17}$$

where $i, k = 1, 2, \cdots, r$.

Thus, according to expressions (6.2), when $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_i = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2n+1}{2+a_i} \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{6.18}$$

In Expression (6.18), since $2n+1$ and $2+a_i$ are integers, $\frac{2n+1}{2+a_i}$ is not an integer, otherwise x_i must be a prime factor of $2n+1$, but it contradicts the fact that x_i should not be a prime factor of $2n+1$. Thus whether the limit in Expression (6.18) exists or does not exist, x_i should not be an integer.

Hence, when $n \to \infty$, no group of primes q_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ can satisfy Equation (5.10) and at least one of x_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ in solutions to Equation (5.10) is not an integer.

The proof of the lemma is completed. □

Lemma 6.3. *By Definition (5.2) and with* $det(\boldsymbol{A}) \neq 2^r$*, when* x_i *is the solution to Equation (5.10) and its corresponding expected solution is the prime* q_{j_i} *for* $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$*, then at least an inequality* $|x_i - q_{j_i}| > 0$ *always holds for any big positive number* n *greater than a positive number* n_0*.*

Proof. Based upon Lemma (6.1), let consider values $\varepsilon_i = |x_i - q_{j_i}|$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $\varepsilon_n = \max\{\varepsilon_i | i = 1, 2, \cdots, r\}$.

Since by Lemma (6.2) there is

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_i \neq \lim_{n\to\infty} q_{j_i} \texttt{ or } \lim_{n\to\infty} |x_i - q_{j_i}| \neq 0,$$

then we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_i = \lim_{n\to\infty} |x_i - q_{j_i}| > 0 \texttt{ and } \varepsilon_\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n > 0.$$

Thus for any given small positive value ε smaller than ε_∞, a big positive number n_ε can always be found to obtain at least an inequality $|x_i - q_{j_i}| \geq \varepsilon$ for any big positive number n not smaller than the big positive number n_ε.

Therefore only small values of n can satisfy equations $x_i - q_{j_i} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$. Let define a positive number

$$n_0 = \max\{n | x_i - q_{j_i} = 0 \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r\}.$$

Then for any given small positive value ε smaller than ε_∞, a big positive number n_ε can always be found to obtain at least an inequality $|x_i - q_{j_i}| \geq \varepsilon$ for $n \geq n_\varepsilon > n_0$.

The proof of the lemma is completed. □

7. Theorems of primes

7.1. **Main theorem.**

Theorem 7.1 (Main theorem)**.** *For every number* n *greater than a positive number* n_0*, let* q *be an odd prime number smaller than* $\sqrt{2n}$ *and* $d = 2n + 1 - 2q$*, then there is always at least an odd number* d *which does not contain any odd prime factor smaller than* $\sqrt{2n}$ *and must be a prime number greater than* $2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}$*.*

Proof. Let consider any number n greater than n_0. According to definitions in Sec. (5) and by using the prime set P, take $p_i \in P$ and let an odd number $c_i = 2n+1-2p_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, l$, then we can form a group of equalities as follows

$$2p_i + c_i = 2n + 1 \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, l. \tag{7.1}$$

When p_i is a prime factor of $2n + 1$ where $1 \leq i \leq l$, c_i must be a composite number with a prime factor p_i or equal to p_i, then the corresponding i^{th} equation can be removed from the group of equations (7.1).

Hence, by using the prime set Q, take $q_i \in Q$ and let an odd number $d_i = 2n + 1 - 2q_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, then we can form a group of equalities as follows

$$2q_i + d_i = 2n + 1 \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, m. \tag{7.2}$$

For $n > n_0 > 15$, there is $q_1 < \sqrt{2n}$. Since q_i is an odd prime number then d_i and $2n + 1$ have no common prime factors. Also q_i is neither a prime factor of d_i nor a prime factor of $2n + 1$.

Let assume that every odd number d_i contains prime factors smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ or can be expressed as the product of primes smaller than n, that is, assume that all of odd numbers d_i are composite numbers. Thus, by using expressions (5.7-5.9), we can form a group of linear equations

$$2x_i + a_{i,j_i}x_{j_i} = 2n+1 \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{7.3}$$

or in the matrix form as Equation (5.10). By Definition (5.2) $det(\mathbf{A}) \neq 0$.

When all of odd numbers d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ are composite numbers, Equation (5.10) can be solved and solutions to Equation (5.10) should satisfy

$$x_i = q_i \texttt{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots, r. \tag{7.4}$$

Now, let investigate solutions to equations (7.3) or (5.10) to verify whether the assumption that all of odd numbers d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ are composite numbers, is true or false.

When $rank(\mathbf{A}) = r = 1$, since q_1 is not a prime factor of d_1 and $q_1 < \sqrt{2n} < q_2$, d_1 must be a prime number greater than $2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}$.

Then, since $det(\mathbf{A}) \neq 2^r$, it can be proved by lemmas (6.1) and (6.2) for the positive number $n \to \infty$ or by lemmas (6.1) and (6.3) for any big positive number n satisfying $n_0 < n < \infty$, that at least one of x_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ in solutions to Equation (5.10) is neither its corresponding expected solution q_i nor an integer. Hence, solutions x_i can not satisfy Equation (7.4) and at least one of d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ is a prime number greater than $2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}$.

In the investigation of solutions of a group of linear equations (7.3), reductions to absurdity are derived and the assumption that all of odd numbers d_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ are composite numbers, is proved false. Hence, it is proved that there is at least an odd number d_i where $1 \leq i \leq r$, which does not contain any odd prime factor smaller than $\sqrt{2n}$ and must be a prime number greater than $2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

For small values of numbers n greater than 3, the assertion in the theorem has been verified for $2n + 1 = N \leq 1.6 \times 10^{10}$ and some higher small ranges up to 4.0×10^{10} by the author. The positive number n_0 has been found being equal to $19,875$.

7.2. **Representation of odd numbers.**

Theorem 7.2. *All odd integers greater than 5 can be represented as the sum of an odd prime number and an even semiprime.*

Proof. Let put the theorem algebraically, $2n + 1 = p + 2q$ always has a solution in primes p and q for $n > 2$.

First for $n \leq n_0$ where n_0 is a positive number, we can easily find pairs of primes p and q satisfying

$$2n + 1 = p + 2q.$$

Actually, for small values of numbers n greater than 2, the assertion in the theorem has been verified for $2n + 1 = N \leq 10^9$ by Corbitt[3].

Then for $n > n_0$, by Theorem (7.1), we can find at least a pair of primes $q < \sqrt{2n}$ and $p = 2n + 1 - 2q$ satisfying

$$2n + 1 = p + 2q.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Lemoine's conjecture is proved. □

7.3. **Distribution of primes in short intervals.**

Theorem 7.3. *For every positive number* m *there is always a prime* p *between* m^2 *and* $(m+1)^2$.

Proof. Since for $1 \le m \le \sqrt{2n_0}$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, such as the smallest primes between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$ for $m = 1, 2, \cdots$ are $2, 5, \cdots$, let consider any number m greater than $\sqrt{2n_0}$.

Let a number n satisfy $2n-1 \le (m+1)^2 \le 2n$, then we have

$$n > n_0 \texttt{ and } m \le \sqrt{2n} - 1.$$

By Theorem (7.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n + 1 - 2q > 2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n} = (\sqrt{2n} - 1)^2.$$

Thus, there must be

$$m^2 < p < 2n - 1 \le (m+1)^2.$$

The inequality shows that there is always a prime p between m^2 and $(m+1)^2$. This completes the proof of the theorem and the Legendre's conjecture is proved. □

Theorem 7.4. *For every positive number* m *there are always three primes between* m^3 *and* $(m+1)^3$. *The first one is between* m^3 *and* $m^2(m+1)$, *the second one is between* $m^2(m+1)$ *and* $m(m+1)^2$, *and the third one is between* $m(m+1)^2$ *and* $(m+1)^3$.

Proof. Since for $1 \le m \le \sqrt[3]{2n_0}$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, such as the primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$ for $m = 1, 2, \cdots$ are {2,3,5}, {11,13,19}, ..., let consider any number m greater than $\sqrt[3]{2n_0}$.

First let a number $n = m^2(m+1)/2$, then we have $n > n_0$ and

$$2n - 2\sqrt{2n} = m^2(m+1) - 2m\sqrt{m+1} > m^3.$$

By Theorem (7.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n + 1 - 2q > 2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q \le m\sqrt{m+1} \texttt{ and } m^3 < p < 2n = m^2(m+1).$$

The inequalities show that there is a prime p between m^3 and $m^2(m+1)$.

Next let the number $n = m(m+1)^2/2$, then we have $n > n_0$ and

$$2n - 2\sqrt{2n} = m(m+1)^2 - 2\sqrt{m}(m+1) > m^2(m+1).$$

By Theorem (7.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n + 1 - 2q > 2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q \le \sqrt{m}(m+1) \texttt{ and } m^2(m+1) < p < 2n = m(m+1)^2.$$

The inequalities show that there is a prime p between $m^2(m+1)$ and $m(m+1)^2$.

Thirdly let the number n satisfy

$$m(m+1)^2 + m(m+2) \le 2n \le (m+1)^3,$$

then we have $n > n_0$ and

$$2n - 2\sqrt{2n} \geq m(m+1)^2 + m(m+2) - 2\sqrt{m+1}(m+1) > m(m+1)^2.$$

By Theorem (7.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n+1-2q > 2n+1-2\sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q \leq \sqrt{m+1}(m+1) \texttt{ and } m(m+1)^2 < p < 2n \leq (m+1)^3.$$

The inequalities show that there is a prime p between $m(m+1)^2$ and $(m+1)^3$.

Thus, for every positive number m there are always three primes between m^3 and $(m+1)^3$. The first one is between m^3 and $m^2(m+1)$, the second one is between $m^2(m+1)$ and $m(m+1)^2$, and the third one is between $m(m+1)^2$ and $(m+1)^3$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 7.5. *For every positive number m there are always k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$ where k is a positive integer greater than 2. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, there is always a prime between $m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}$ and $m^{k-i}(m+1)^i$.*

Proof. Since for every k we can always choose a suitable value of m to make a number $n > n_0$ where n_0 is a positive number, such as for $k = 3$, we can choose $m = [\sqrt[3]{2n_0}] + 1$, let consider any number m which can make the number $n > n_0$.

For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, let the number $n = m^{k-i}(m+1)^i/2$, since

$$m^{(k-i)/2} > 2(m+1)^{1-i/2}$$

then we have

$$m^{k-i}(m+1)^{i-1} - 2m^{(k-i)/2}(m+1)^{i/2} > 0$$

and

$$2n - 2\sqrt{2n} = m^{k-i}(m+1)^i - 2m^{(k-i)/2}(m+1)^{i/2} > m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}.$$

By Theorem (7.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n+1-2q > 2n+1-2\sqrt{2n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$q \leq m^{(k-i)/2}(m+1)^{i/2} \texttt{ and } m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1} < p < 2n = m^{k-i}(m+1)^i.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between $m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}$ and $m^{k-i}(m+1)^i$.

Thus, for every positive number m there are always k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, there is always a prime between $m^{k-i+1}(m+1)^{i-1}$ and $m^{k-i}(m+1)^i$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 7.6. *For every positive number $m \geq a^k - 1$ where a is an integer greater than 1 and k is an integer greater than 2, if there are at least S_k primes between m^k and $(m+1)^k$, then there are always S_{k+1} primes between m^{k+1} and $(m+1)^{k+1}$ where $S_{k+1} = aS_k$.*

Proof. Since for any number $m \geq a^k - 1$, there is always a number s satisfying $m^{1+1/k} \leq s \leq (m+1)^{1+1/k} - a$. Then there are $m^{k+1} \leq s^k$ and $(s+a)^k \leq (m+1)^{k+1}$.

Since there are at least S_k primes between s^k and $(s+1)^k$ for $s \geq m \geq a^k - 1$, then there are also at least S_k primes between $(s+i)^k$ and $(s+i+1)^k$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, a-1$. Thus, there are always S_{k+1} primes between m^{k+1} and $(m+1)^{k+1}$ where $S_{k+1} = aS_k$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 7.7. *There is always a prime p between $m - 2m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is a positive number greater than 4.*

Proof. Since for $5 \leq m \leq 2n_0$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, let consider any positive number m greater than $2n_0$.

Let a number $n = (m+1)/2$. Then for $m > 2n_0$ we have $n > n_0$. By Theorem (7.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n + 1 - 2q > 2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}.$$

Since $1 + 2\sqrt{2n-1} > 2\sqrt{2n}$ and the prime number $q \geq 3$, we have

$$2n - 1 - 2\sqrt{2n-1} < 2n - 2\sqrt{2n} < p < 2n - 1.$$

First for $m = 2n - 1$ let $m - 2m^\theta = 2n - 1 - 2\sqrt{2n-1} = m - 2\sqrt{m}$, then we have $\theta = 1/2$ and

$$q < m^\theta \texttt{ and } m - 2m^\theta < p < m.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between $m - 2m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is an odd number greater than $2n_0$.

Next for $m = 2n$ let $m - 2m^\theta = 2n - 2\sqrt{2n} = m - 2\sqrt{m}$, then we have $\theta = 1/2$ and

$$q < m^\theta \texttt{ and } m - 2m^\theta < p < m.$$

The last inequality shows that there is a prime p between $m - 2m^\theta$ and m where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is an even number greater than $2n_0$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 7.8. *There is always a prime p between m and $m + 2m^\theta$ where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is a positive number.*

Proof. Since for $1 \leq m \leq 2n_0$ where n_0 is a positive number we can easily verify the theorem true, let consider any positive number m greater than $2n_0$.

Let a number n satisfy

$$m \leq 2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n} < m + 1,$$

then we have $n > n_0$ for $m > 2n_0$ and

$$\sqrt{m} + 1 \leq \sqrt{2n} < \sqrt{m+1} + 1$$

and

$$m + 2(\sqrt{m} + 1) \leq 2n + 1 < m + 2(\sqrt{m+1} + 1).$$

Let consider the equation

$$2n + 1 = m + 2m^\theta + 2f(m,x) - 2\sqrt{m} \texttt{ where } f(m,x) = \sqrt{m+x} + 1. \tag{7.5}$$

When substituting $f(m,0)$ into Equation (7.5), we obtain

$$m^\theta \geq \sqrt{m} \texttt{ and } \theta \geq 1/2$$

and when substituting $f(m,1)$ into Equation (7.5), we obtain

$$m^\theta < \sqrt{m} \texttt{ and } \theta < 1/2.$$

Thus, we can always choose a suitable value of $f(m,x)$ to get

$$m^\theta = \sqrt{m} \texttt{ and } \theta = 1/2.$$

By Theorem (7.1), for $n > n_0$ we can find at least a pair of primes

$$q < \sqrt{2n} \texttt{ and } p = 2n + 1 - 2q > 2n + 1 - 2\sqrt{2n}.$$

Since any odd prime q is greater than 2, then $p \leq 2n - 2$. For $0 \leq x \leq 1$, since $f(m,x) - \sqrt{m} < 3/2$, then the values of θ are in a small neighborhood of $1/2$ and the values of $m + 2m^\theta$ are in the open interval $(2n - 2, 2n + 1)$ and greater than the upper bound of the prime p, that is, $p \leq 2n - 2$. Hence we have

$$m < p < m + 2m^\theta < 2n + 1.$$

The inequality shows that there is a prime p between m and $m + 2m^\theta$ where $\theta = 1/2$ and m is a positive number greater than $2n_0$.

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 7.9. *The inequality* $\sqrt{p_{i+1}} - \sqrt{p_i} < 1$ *holds for all* $i > 0$*, where* p_i *is the* i^{th} *prime number.*

Proof. The inequality $\sqrt{p_{i+1}} - \sqrt{p_i} < 1$ can be written as

$$g_i = p_{i+1} - p_i < 2\sqrt{p_i} + 1.$$

By Theorem (7.8), let a number $m = p_i$, then there is always a prime p between p_i and $p_i + 2\sqrt{p_i}$, therefore we obtain

$$g_i = p_{i+1} - p_i < 2\sqrt{p_i}.$$

Thus we have

$$g_i = p_{i+1} - p_i < 2\sqrt{p_i} + 1 \texttt{ and } \sqrt{p_{i+1}} - \sqrt{p_i} < 1.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem and the Andrica's conjecture is proved. □

References

1. Wapedia - Wiki, *Lemoine's conjecture.*
2. Weisstein, Eric W., *Levy's Conjecture.* MathWorld.
3. D. Corbit, *Conjecture on Odd Numbers.* sci.math posting. Nov 19, 1999. http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.math/msg/539c96e47e3ed582?hl=en.
4. L. Hodges, *A Lesser-Known Goldbach Conjecture.* Math. Mag. 66, 45-47, 1993.
5. H. Levy, *On Goldbach's Conjecture.* Math. Gaz. 47, 274, 1963.
6. N. J. A. Sloane, Sequence A046927 in *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.*
7. John O. Kiltinen and Peter B. Young, *Goldbach, Lemoine, and a Know/Don't Know Problem.* Mathematics Magazine, Vol. 58, No. 4 (Sep., 1985), pp. 195C203 (http://www.jstor.org/stable/2689513?seq=7)
8. W. Sierpinski, *Elementary Theory of Numbers.* Hafner, New York, 1964(2nd edition, North-Holland, Amsterdam,1988).
9. Richard K. Guy, *Unsolved Problems in Number Theory.* New York: Springer-Verlag 2004: C1
10. Wapedia - Wiki, *Legendre's conjecture.*
11. Weisstein, Eric W., *Legendre's conjecture.* MathWorld.
12. J. R. Chen, *On the Distribution of Almost Primes in an Interval.* Sci. Sinica 18, 611-627, 1975.

13. G. H. Hardy, and W. M. Wright, *Unsolved Problems Concerning Primes.* 2.8 and Appendix 3 in An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, 5th ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, pp. 19 and 415-416, 1979.
14. P. Ribenboim, *The New Book of Prime Number Records.* 3rd ed. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 132-134 and 206-208, 1996.
15. H. Iwaniec, and J. Pintz, *Primes in Short Intervals.* Monatsh. f. Math. 98, 115-143, 1984.
16. N. J. A. Sloane, Sequences A007491/M1389 and A014085 in *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.*
17. W. H. Mills, *A Prime-Representing Function.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 53, 604, 1947.
18. D. Andrica, *Note on a Conjecture in Prime Number Theory.* Studia Univ. Babes-Bolyai Math. 31, 44-48, 1986.

Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, CHINA
Current address: Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, CHINA
E-mail address: `tanshanguang@163.com`